

A
DISCOURSE
 Concerning the
CELEBRATION
 OF
DIVINE SERVICE
 IN AN
Unknown Tongue.

by John Williams D.D.

L O N D O N,

Printed for Richard Chiswell, at the Rose and Crown
 in S. Paul's Church-Yard. MDC LXXXV.

A
 DISCOURSE
 CONTAINING
 THE
 OF
 DIVINE SERVICE
 IN AN

English Congregation

Printed for R. B. Smith at the Press of the
 in S. Paul's Church-Yard. MDCCLXXV.

ADVERTISEMENT.

Cardinal Hofius; Sanders; *Epist. Cler. Gall. Extract. ex Regist. Fac. Par. Procez, &c.* quoted in this Tract by the page, refer to a Book, called, Collectio quorundam gravium Authorum, qui Sacra Scripturæ aut divinarum officiorum in vulgarem Linguam Translationes damnarunt, &c. printed at Paris, 1661.

The Quotation, page 2, though out of Sixtus Senenf. are the Words of Ambrosius Compla, who severely condemning Cajetan for the aforesaid Saying, It is better, &c. gives this as a Reason that that Opinion primò à Diabolo inventa est.

ERRATA.

ADVERTISEMENT.

ERRATA.

PAg. 1. Marg. lin. 3. for 1 read 2. p. 8. l. 20. *where, after*
p. 21. marg. dele *In Genes. Lit. L. c. 8. & in Ps. 97.*
p. 25. l. 26. dele *little*. p. 28. l. 1. after together, 1. for
Conjuration. p. 45. marg. l. 9. dele i. p. 48. l. 26. r. *Stenopulcer*.

ERRATA.

A
DISCOURSE
 CONCERNING THE
CELEBRATION
 OF
 Divine Service
 IN AN
Unknown Tongue.

UPon this Argument the Church of *England* doth fully declare it self in these Words, *It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the Custome of the Primitive Church, to have public Prayers in the Church, or to minister the Sacraments in a Tongue not understood of the people.*

Article 24.

But if we consult the Doctors of the Church of *Rome* about it, we shall find them, as in most other points, differing extreamly amongst themselves. *Mercer*, a very learned person, and Professor of *He-*

Comment. in
Eccles. 5. 1.

In 1 Ep. Co-
rinth. c. 14.

Scapleton.
Quest. quodl.
Quest. 2.
Sixtus Senens.
Biblioth. l. 6.
annot. 263.
Portraiture of
the Church of
Jesus Christ,
c. 14.

Conc. Trid.
Sess. 22. c. 8.

S. C. Answ.
to Dr. Pierce,
c. 15.

Retento ubiq;
enjusq; Eccle-
siae antiquo
ritu.

brew at Paris, is so free as to say, *Temerè fecerunt, &c.* They amongst us have done rashly, that brought in the Custome of praying in an Unknown Tongue, which very often neither they themselves, nor our people understand. And Cardinal Cajetan saith, *Melius est, &c.* It is better for our Church that the publick Prayers in the Congregation be said in a Tongue common to the Priests and people, and not in Latin. Others of them are of another Mind, and say that the having Divine Service in a Tongue known to the people is *new and prophane*, and the Doctrine requiring it *Diaboli calliditatem sapit, smells of the craft of the Devil.* And that the Church in making use of the Latin Tongue therein, *received it by inspiration from the Holy-Ghost*; as a late Author saith.

With what consistence soever the former sort may speak to Truth and Reason; yet I am sure the latter speak with consistence enough to the Opinion, Declarations and Practice of their Church; as is evident from the Council of *Trent* (the present Standard of the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*) which I find thus Englished to my Hands by a noted person of their Church. "Though the Mass contain [great] instruction for Gods faithful people, yet it seemed not expedient to the Fathers [of the Council] that it should be celebrated every where in the Vulgar Tongue: Wherefore retaining in all Churches, the antient Rite [or rather in all places the antient Rite of every Church] approved by the Holy Roman Church, the Mother and Mistress of all Churches; lest Christs Sheep should hunger, and the Children asking Bread, none should be found to break it to them, the
"Holy

“Holy Synod commands Pastors and all that have
 “care of Souls, that during the celebration of Mass,
 “they should frequently either by themselves, or
 “others, expound some part of those things, which
 “are read in it; and among other things let them
 “explain the Mystery of the most Holy Sacrifice,
 [the Words are, *Some Mystery of this Holy Sacri-*
fice] “especially on *Sundays* and Feasts.

Sanctissimi hu-
jus sacrificii
aliquod myste-
rium.
 Canon 9.

And they conclude, “If any one shall say, that
 “Mass ought to be celebrated only in the Vulgar
 “Tongue, let him be *Anathema*.

To this I shall add for a conclusion, the Judg-
 ment of the late Pope *Alexander* the Seventh,
 in a Brief he sent to the Clergy of *France* about a
 Translation of the Missal into that Language, at
 that time newly published; in which he saith, that
 “Some Sons of Perdition had arrived to that mad-
 “ness, as to Translate and Publish it, &c. A No-
 “velty we abhor and detest as the Seed-plot of dis-
 “obedience, rashness, sedition, and schism, and of
 “many other evils, and therefore that French Mis-
 “sal, or what shall hereafter be published in any
 “other manner, we condemn, reprobate and for-
 “bid.

Collectio quo-
rundam Author.
&c. cum Digni-
tis, &c.
 1661.

From all which we may perceive, what an evi-
 dent repugnancy there is betwixt the Doctrine of
 the Church of *England*, and that of *Rome* in the
 matter before us: And therefore for the better un-
 derstanding the Case and discerning which is in the
 Right, and which in the Wrong, I shall discourse of
 it in the following order.

First, I shall consider the Phrase, *an Unknown*
Tongue.

B 2

Secondly,

Secondly, I shall enquire into the lawfulness and expediency of celebrating Divine Service in a Tongue not understood by the People. For so much is affirmed by the Council of *Trent*, and denied by the Church of *England*.

Thirdly, I shall enquire, whether the celebrating Service in a Tongue not understood by the people, hath been the antient custome of every Church? For so much also is affirmed by that Council, and denied by the Church of *England*.

Fourthly, I shall consider, whether the Provision made by the foresaid Council, of having *Some part of the Mass expounded*, be sufficient to countervail the mischief of having the whole in a Tongue not understood by the people, and to excuse that Church in their injunction of it?

Fifthly, I shall enquire whether upon the whole, the publick Service of God ought not to be celebrated in a Tongue vulgarly understood? Which Proposition whosoever holds, is anathematized by the foresaid Council: And yet is owned by the Church of *England*.

S E C T. I

Of the Phrase Service in an Unknown Tongue.

Toward the fixing the sence of this Phrase, we are to observe,

- I. That there is *the Vulgar Tongue* of a Country, which is universally understood by the Natives of what rank or quality soever. Such was the *Latin* Tongue formerly in *Rome*; such now is *English* with us. Before

Before we dismiss this, it is to be further considered,

1. That there are different Dialects or wayes of expressing and pronouncing the same Tongue : which differences of Words, or pronunciation do not so alter the Tongue, but that throughout under all these variations it agrees in much more than it differs ; so that he that speaks the one, is generally understood by him that useth the other. Such, anciently were the different Dialects of the *Greek Tongue*, well known to the learned : And such are the Northern, Southern and Western wayes of speaking amongst our selves in this Nation.

2. Where there are these different Dialects, there generally is one way of speaking, which either from the eloquence, or fashionableness of it, so far prevails, as to be the Standard of the Tongue, and to be used in Writing Books, Letters, &c. and is understood by all. Such I conceive was anciently that which is called *the common Dialect in Greek* : And of the like kind is that which is spoken in and about the Court, and by Scholars and persons of a liberal education amongst us ; and elsewhere.

3. If a Tongue in process of time, by a mixture of other Nations, or by the removal of a people from one Country to another, or by any other cause comes to be so altered, as the Mother and Original Tongue is not to be understood (as *Ledesma* saith it is in *Spain*) then it is no longer a *Vulgar Tongue*, but is to be reckoned amongst the unknown.

*De Script. Div.
& Missæ sacr.
celebr. ling.
vulg. c. 20. n. 5.*

II. There is a *common Tongue*, which though not the Mother or National Tongue, is however with that commonly and generally understood.

II.

Thus

Eccl. pro Archid.
Hieron. Tom. 9.
l. 2. procm. ad
Galat.
Tom. 3. pref.
l. in paralip.

Ledeſma c. 33.

Thus it was antiently in many places with the *Greek* and *Latin*. The former of which, was once the *common Tongue* of a great part of the then known World, and continued ſo to be from the time of *Cicero*, to that of *S. Jerom*, for the ſpace that is of 400. if not 500. Years. Inſomuch, that not only the Scriptures were read in *Greek* in the publick Congregations from *Egypt* to *Conſtantinople*; as *S. Jerom* informs us; but the Chriſtians alſo had their Worſhip (as is confeſſed) and the Fathers preached to them in that Language. So did *S. Chryſoſtome*, *S. Baſil*, *S. Cyril* and *S. Athanaſius* in their ſeveral Sees of *Antioch*, *Ceſarea*, *Jeruſalem*, and *Alexandria*.

L. Valla Eleg.
pref.
Ledeſma, c. 3.
n. 7.

L. 1. confeſſ.
c. 14.
Retract. l. 1.
c. 20.
In Pf. 138.
De verb. A-
poſtol. Serm. 24.
De Doctr.
Chriſt. l. 2. c. 14

And the *Latin* was ſo well known, underſtood, and commonly ſpoken together with the *Vulgar Tongue* in diverſe Countries, (through the induſtry of the *Romans* in their ſeveral Provinces) that the *Vulgar* was ſcarcely more. Thus we find it in the *Proconſular Africa*, where (though leſs accurately ſpoken than at *Rome*) it was ſo well underſtood, that *S. Auſtin* ſaith, he learned that Language of his Nurſe, and at play, and did write as well as preach in it for the uſe of the *Vulgar*: And calls it *our Speech*, whereas the *Puniſh* was the *Vulgar Tongue* of that Country.

And ſuch a *common Tongue* is *French* in *Flanders*, *Lingua Franca* in the *Streights*, and *Engliſh* in ſome parts of *Wales*.

III.

III. There is a *Learned Tongue*, which though common amongſt the *Learned*, yet they being few in compariſon of the *Vulgar*, that underſtand it not, it cannot be called a *common Tongue*: Such are *Greek* and *Latin* now.

IV. There

IV. There is a Tongue understood and spoken by none in a Nation, or so few, as are next to none; and which if used in Divine Offices would be wholly unintelligible. Such are *Persick* and *Indian* with us.

IV.

The use of all this niceness, is partly to clear the state of the Question, and partly to prevent many of the Objections which the case is cumbered with: And without the observing of which, the Dispute will be turned from the point that is controverted, to that which is not. As it happens for the most part among those of the Church of *Rome* that undertake the management of this Cause; who do either distinguish where they are not to distinguish, or do not distinguish where they should distinguish. For sometimes they oppose the Dialects of a Tongue to that Tongue of which they are the Dialects: At other times they oppose the common Tongue to the Vulgar: Sometimes they confound the Learned Tongue with the common: And then again oppose the learned and utterly unknown, as if these two were of as different kinds as known and unknown.

To give an instance of each of these:

Do they undertake to shew how unfit and unreasonable it is to translate the Service or Scriptures into a Vulgar Tongue? they endeavour to make it out by shewing how unfit it is to think of Translating, and how unreasonable it is to expect they should be translated into the several Dialects of each Tongue? Would they farther shew that the Divine Offices, &c. were not of old so translated? they attempt to prove it from their not having been translated into different Dialects. As if the Dialects of a Tongue differed as much from each other, and all from

*Ledesma, c. 9.
n. 4, 5, 9.
c. 20 n. 2.
Sandersorat.
de Ling. Offic.
Eccl.*

from the main Tongue of a Nation, as a learned Tongue differs from the Vulgar. Which is (to speak charitably) for want of observing, that the Dialects are but several modes of speaking the same Tongue; and that ordinarily there is some common Standard, which (as I have said) over-rules the rest, and is a guide common to all: As here in *England*, notwithstanding there be several Dialects, and that there is one in *Scotland* differs much from them all; yet there is but one Translation of the Bible, and one Service for the use of the whole, and that is fully if not equally understood by all.

Furthermore, would they prove, that anciently the Christian Churches used not a Vulgar Tongue in Divine Service? they presently multiply Authorities to shew, that in many places they used *Greek* and *Latin*, and that *Greek* and *Latin* were oftentimes not the Vulgar Tongues where they were so used. As if the *common Tongue* (for such were those *two* in elder times; where they were not the Vulgar) was opposed to the Vulgar, as much as unknown is to known; and each was inconsistent with the other. Thus they tell us from *S. Jerom*, "That the Vulgar Tongue in *Galatia* was in effect the same with that of the *Treviri* in *Germany*: And "yet there, and in the neighbouring Countries, they "had the Scriptures, if not their Divine Service in "*Greek*. Not observing that *Greek* was the *common Tongue* of those parts, and that both that and a Vulgar were there freely and generally spoken; as *Greek* and *Latin*, as well as the *Gallick* Tongues were so frequent in *Maffilia*, that it was called *Trilinguis*, as *S. Jerom* shews in the same Dissertation

*Ledesma, c. 9.
n. 6.*

*Licetus de
SS. in
vulg. non
ver. p. 51.*

*Billarm. de ver.
bo, l. 2. c. 15.*

tation of his. So that these two, the Common and Vulgar, are so far from being inconsistent, that (notwithstanding the bold saying of our Countryman Sanders, *That the common people understand nothing but their Mother Tongue.*) The experience of all Ages, as well as our own shews that they are frequently met together.

Orat. ut antea.

But to proceed, would they demonstrate that they do and may lawfully use the *Latin* now in Divine Service, they attempt with great industry to prove that both that and the *Greek* were antiently used therein. And so they confound the learned and the common Tongue, and compare those times and places, in which the *Latin* and *Greek* were commonly known and understood, with our times and places, in which neither of them are understood but by the Learned.

Ledesma, c. 9.
n. 1. c. 27. n. 9.

Lastly, Would they shew that *S. Paul*, in *1 Corinthians*, 14. doth not oppose Service in *Latin*, they undertake to shew, That he opposeth no other Service than what is altogether unknown and no Body understands, as *Persick* and *Arabick*, and that he doth not condemn a Learned Tongue; thereby supposing the Learned Tongue and Tongue altogether unknown to be different in kind, whereas they only differ so, that the one is rarely understood and by very few, in comparison, and the other is understood by none.

Ledesma, c. 27.
n. 9.
Sanders orat.
Bellarm. de
verb. l. 2. c. 16.

Now in all this they say little or nothing to the purpose. For if they plead for their *Latin* Service, as *Greek* was in *Galatia*, and *Latin* in *Africa*, who is their Adversary? For these Tongues were (as I have shewed) in those and the like places as well or little less spoken and understood than the Vul-

gar and Mother Tongues. And the Protestants do not think it unlawful to have the common Service in a Tongue which is commonly understood (though it be not the Vulgar Tongue of the Nation) especially in Maritim and Provincial Countries, where there is a concourse of diverse Nations, and where either these several Languages are understood, or there is a compound Language that serves for all, as the *Lingua Franca* before spoken of.

But if they plead for *Latin*, as it is now (when a Dead and Learned Tongue) that is where it is not known at all, as in the *West-Indies* (where yet it is as much used by those of the *Roman* communion in Mass, as in *Europe*) or where it is not known to the Vulgar people, as it is with us, and every where else, then they speak to the purpose, (for that the Reformed do oppose) but then the way of arguing hitherto taken notice of is of no use to them in the World; and is no more to the purpose than if they would undertake to prove that there is at this day a famous University at *Athens*, and that *Latin* is the Vulgar Tongue now at *Rome*, because these were so formerly.

So that if we will know where the Controversie lies, and what is contended for and against, we must restore things to their proper places; and I think all may be brought to an Issue, by putting and resolving this plain Question, *viz.*

S E C T. II.

Qu. Whether it be lawful and expedient to use such a Tongue in the publick Worship of God; as is not vulgarly or commonly understood by the people; according to the way at this day required and practised in the Church of Rome?

If we would enquire into the lawfulness of such things as appertain to Divine Worship, we must apply our selves to the Holy Scripture; being in matters of that nature to determine of Right and Wrong, Lawful and Unlawful, according to the Directions, Commands, and Prohibitions of it. If we would be satisfied about their Expedience, we must consider the Nature, Ends, and Use of what we enquire about. This therefore is a proper method for the Resolution of the foregoing Question: But because the Apostle (in his Discourse upon this Subject, 1. Cor. 14.) doth argue from the ends and use of the several Offices belonging to Divine Worship, and because the like Order may give some light and force to what follows; I shall first of all,

I. Treat of the Ends for which Divine Worship, and the several Offices of it were instituted.

II. Consider whether those Ends may be attained when the Worship is performed in a Tongue not understood?

III. Whether the Worship so performed as to leave those ends unattainable, will be accepted by God?

IV. I shall consider the Apostle's Discourse upon this Argument; and whether it can be reasonably concluded from thence, That Divine Worship so administred as not to be understood of the people is unlawful.

I. In the first of these the Masters of Controversie in the *Romish* Church do proceed with great tenderness and no little obscurity. For would we know what the Worship is they would have in an Unknown Tongue? they answer, it is the publick only they defend.

*P. Sanctæ not.
in Epi. P. Mo-
linei, c. 17. n. 6.
T. G. First re-
ply to Dr. Stil-
lingfleet, sect. 3.*

For as for private, saith one, "It is lawful for every one to offer his lesser Prayers to God in what Tongue soever he pleaseth. And saith another, "All Catholicks are taught to say their private Prayers in their Mother Tongue.

As if it were possible to assign such a vast difference betwixt them (when the Dispositions, Reasons and Ends, required and intended, are the same) that what is lawful, expedient and necessary in the one, is unlawful, inexpedient and unnecessary in the other; Or as if the saying private Prayers in *Latin*, was never heard of, practised, or encouraged in their Church.

*De verbo, l. 2.
c. 16. Sect. obj.
quart.*

Again, Would we understand to what purposes the Divine Offices do serve; and whether the Edification, Instruction and Consolation of the people be not some of those Ends. *Bellarmin* answers,

I. "That the principal end of Divine Offices is not the instruction or consolation of the people, but a Worship due to God from the Church. As if there were no regard to be had to the special ends of those Offices, such as the *Instruction and Consolation*

lation of the people: Or as if God could be honoured by that Worship, where those ends are not regarded.

2.) The Rhemists add, "That Prayers are not made to teach, make learned, or increase knowledge, though by occasion they sometimes instruct; but their especial use is to offer our Hearts, desires and Wants to God, &c. As if there were no Offices in God's Worship appointed for *Instruction*, and *increase of Knowledge*; and which are performed in an Unknown Tongue amongst them, as well as Prayer. Or as if their Adversaries did either deny it to be the special use of Prayer, *To offer our Hearts, &c. to God*: Or did affirm that the special use of it is, *To teach, make learned, and increase knowledge*; as they with others do falsely suggest, and would fain have believed.

Annst. 1 Cor.
14. p. 163.

Censur. proposit.
Erasmi, prop. 6.
Poncet discours.
de L' Advis,
ch. 1.

But to set this in a better light; and that we may understand what are the Ends and Uses for which Divine Worship was appointed, and after what manner they are to be respected; It is to be observed,

1. That Divine Worship in its first notion respects God as its Object; and so the end of it in general, is the giving Honour to him by suitable Thoughts, Words and Actions.

2. That he hath appointed several wayes and Offices by which he will be so honoured; and in which, as the Honour doth terminate in him, so there redounds from thence benefit to the Church.

3. That the Benefits redound to the Church according to the nature of those Offices, and the special

special Ends they were designed unto ; As the Word of God is for our instruction and comfort, &c. The Lord's Supper for the encrease of Faith in God, and love to him through Jesus Christ. The Praising of God is to raise our Affections, and to make us more sensible of his goodness, and to quicken us in our duty. "The especial use of Prayer (that I. may use the Words forecited) "is to offer up our Hearts, Wants and Desires "to God ; and that by conversing with him, we "may be the more ardently excited to the love "and adoration of him (as the *Trent* Catechism doth expresse it)

Reb. Annot.

*Part. 4. c. 2.
Sect. 7. 8.*

4. That those Offices are to be performed so as may effectually answer those Ends, and as we may receive the benefits they were appointed for : From whence it follows,

5. That if the Offices of Divine Worship are to be performed by Words, those Words and that Tongue (in which they are administered) must be such as will not obstruct but promote, and in their nature are qualified to attain those Ends. And if those Ends cannot be attained without the Tongue, in which the Service is performed, be understood : It makes that means as necessary in its kind as the End ; and it is as necessary that the Tongue used for those Ends in Divine Worship, be understood, as that those Ends should be respected, or that there should be a Tongue used at all. For it is not God but Man that is immediately respected in the Words (since there is no more need of Words to God, than of Words that are vulgarly understood) and so it is not for him but Man, that this Tongue or that, or indeed that any Tongue at all is used.

And

And if it be requisite that there be a Tongue and Words used in publick Worship, and which all persons present are supposed to joyn in, and receive benefit by; then it is as necessary for the same reason to use Words significant and understood, as to use any Words at all. "For, saith S. Austin, "what doth the soundness of Speech profit, if not "followed with the Understanding of the Hearer? "Seeing there is no reason at all for our speaking, if "what we speak is not understood by them, for "whom, that they might understand, we spoke at

De Doctr.
Ch. i. §. 16.

all. From what hath been said, we may be able to vindicate such Arguments of the Protestants for Divine Service in a known and vulgar Tongue, as were taken from the Ends of Worship, against the replies made to them by their Adversaries of the Romish Church. As,

1. The Protestants argue in general, that the End of Divine Offices is for the Edification, Instruction and Consolation of the people; but these Ends cannot be attained in a Tongue not understood by them.

To this it is replied, "That the Proposition "is false, because the chief end of Divine Offices is not the Instruction or Consolation of the "people, but a Worship or Honour due to "God,

Bellarmin. de
verbo, l. 2. c. 16.
Sect. Obj. 4.

An Answer that became not so great a Man. For (1.) He argues as if those Ends were opposed, which are not only consistent, as Principal and Subordinate, but also inseparable in the Case; such are the Honour of God, and the Edification of the Church.

2. The

(2.) The Answer is not to the purpose, unless it could be proved, That either the Edification of the People, is no End of the Divine Offices; or that the Worship is compleat, though that End be not respected or attained in them. But if it be an End, and the Service defective without that End be pursued; then it is not, that this is a subordinate End, and the other a Principal, that will destroy the force of the Argument, and justify the use of an Unknown Tongue, when persons are not edified by it.

2. The Protestants argue in particular that there can no profit proceed to the Church from Prayers not understood.

Ballam. ibid.
Señ. Obj. 2.
Ledsma, c. 13.
n. 11.

To this it is answered, "That it is false, because the Prayer of the Church is not made to the people, but to God for the people. And so there is no need that the people understand, and it is sufficient if God understands."

But (1.) if this Argument hold, it will prove that which they do decline, and be a Reason as well for Private as Publick Prayers in an Unknown Tongue. For Private Prayer is also made to God, and by this way of reasoning it will follow, That it is sufficient that God understands it, though it is not understood by him that useth it.

(2.) Grant we to them what is not to be denied, That Prayer is not made to the people, but to God for the people: Yet grant they must and do to us, that, It is the offering up our Hearts, Wants and Desires to God, and is to excite us to the Love and Adoration of him.

ut supra.

But

But if we cannot offer up our Hearts, Wants and Desires to God, nor be excited to the Love and Adoration of him, by what we do not understand ; then it is as necessary for us to understand, as it is to have those Qualifications when we pray. For both are supposed ; for that we pray, respects God, but that we speak in publick Prayer respects the Church. And though the principal End (as they call it) be regarded, and it be an Honour and Worship given to God : Yet if the less principal be neglected, and the Service is not ordered to the encrease of Faith, Love and Devotion in those that offer it (as it cannot be where the Words, and so the things prayed for in those Words, are not understood) it makes the Honour, said to be given to God, next to none : And it is much at one, whether there was no end at all propounded in Worship, or such an End, as through a defect in it shall render the service no better in it self, and no more acceptable to God, than if there were none. But of this more anon.

II. I shall consider whether these Ends for which Divine Service is appointed, can be attained, when it is performed in a Tongue that is not understood ? The Apostle saith, That the Offices of Divine Worship are intended and should be ordered for the Edification of the Church, 1 Cor. 14. 4, 5. That is, say the Rhemists, (explaining that Phrase) For increase of Faith, true Knowledge, and a good Life. But when this comes to be applied to the Case of Divine Service administered in an unknown Tongue, they set aside the increase of Knowledge and Instruction, as if it were not concerned in it. So doth Bellarmin, who saith, " Though the Minds

D

" of

Pag. 461.

De verbo, l. 2.
c. 16. Sect.
Obj. 2.

“of common people be not instructed by Service in
 “an Unknown Tongue; yet their affections are
 “not without the benefit of it.

Seff. 22 c. 8.

If this Argument signifies any thing, it must be either because Divine Service is not a means appointed for our Instruction, and then he must thwart not only the Apostle (who saith it is for *Edification*, and consequently for Instruction, a Branch of it) but also their own Church in the Council of Trent, which saith, *That the Mass doth contain great Instruction for the faithful.* Or else he must say that the means of Instruction may be rendred ineffectual at the pleasure of the Church, (as it is granted it is by being in an unknown Tongue) and yet neither the Church be blamed, nor the Institution of such Means for such an End be disparaged, nor the Souls of Men receive any damage by the want of that Instruction, and the Means appointed for it. So that as far as Instruction is an end, and the Divine Service is a means for that End, it is granted that the keeping it in an Unknown Tongue doth defeat that end: For he saith, *That the Minds of common people are not instructed by Service in an Unknown Tongue.* And now what an usurpation is this upon God; to withhold that Means that he has appointed, or to defeat the Means of that End that he hath appointed it for? What an injury to the Souls of Men? And how much necessary must that Church be to the Miscarriage and Damnation of such as perish for want of that Knowledge and Instruction the Service and Offices of the Church do contain, and they might receive from it?

But

But suppose that end be lost, *and the peoples Minds be not instructed; yet their Affections are not without the benefit of it.* This is spoken with a Caution and Reservation becoming one that saw farther into the consequences of what he said, than he cared to own. He saith at large, *their Affections are not without the benefit of it.* But how the Affections could be benefited, without the Mind is instructed; or what the Benefit is which the Affections are not without, he is sparing to tell us. But however the Rhemists advance a little farther; for they with no little confidence do determine, "It is plain that such as pray in *Latin*, though they understand not what they say, do pray with as little tediousness, with as great Affection and Devotion, and oftentimes more than others, that pray in a Tongue they understand. The Cardinal told us, That the Affections are not without benefit, though the Mind be not instructed: But now it is to a Demonstration plain (in these Men's account) that not only the benefit is as great, as if people do understand, but oftentimes greater than if they did understand. So that what more self evident, than that *Ignorance is the Mother of Devotion*? But yet as plain as it is, the Saying is so downright a Contradiction to the common sense of Mankind, that I think a Man may venture as roundly to assert, that *it is plain*, a Man may see without Light, as that he may pray with Affection and Devotion, though he do not understand, and with as great as if he did: And he may with as good a Grace maintain, That the best way to see, is to put out the Light, as affirm with them, That such as pray

Annotat. in
1 Cor. 14.
p. 462.

in *Latin*, though they do not understand, oftentimes pray with more Affection and Devotion than they that do understand.

Leidesma, c. 13.

n. 13.

Censura propo-

sit. Erasmi,

prop 5.

But because this is asserted with so much confidence, and that, *To say that people are not profited without they understand*, is condemned not only as *an erroneous, but wicked assertion*; I shall look back, and (leaving the extravagancy of the latter as self-exposed) consider whether the Affections are not without benefit, and that the Soul can be devout and affected, where the Understanding is not instructed, nor the Mind is concerned in the Service we are conversant in? The resolution of which depends upon the consideration of the Soul of Man, and the several faculties of it.

Concerning which it shall suffice to observe,

1. That in all reasonable and deliberate Acts, there is more or less so necessary a concurrence of the prime faculties of the Soul, *viz.* the Understanding, Will and Affections, that none of them can be said to be excluded. 2. That in all such Acts if the Understanding be not the leading faculty, and of such influence, that the others cannot act without it (which must be supposed, for how can a person affect or choose what he doth not know?) Yet without that, the Acts cannot be termed reasonable. So *Cassiodore*, *No body doth any thing wisely which he doth not understand*. 3. That in the Acts of Religion, the presence of the understanding is as much required as in any other rational Acts whatsoever; *The renewing of the Mind* being there the Spring of all spiritual Action; and the whole called from thence a *reasonable Service*.

In Psalm. 46.

Rom. 12. 1, 2.

Service. And therefore if in other Cases the Affections cannot move or be profited without the help of the Understanding, then as little can it be supposed in Religion, and the Offices belonging to it, where the Understanding is *Sonus Cordis*, (as *S. Austin* calls it, applying it to our purpose) *The note of the Heart.*

In Genes. Lit.
L. c. 8. & in
Pf. 99.

Now to say, *That the Affections are not without profit, though the Mind be not instructed; and that they that do not understand, do pray with as little tediousness, and as great Affection and Devotion as they that do understand* (not to repeat the rest of the stuff before cited) is to say that the Affections have no dependance in Nature upon the Understanding; or that Religion requires less of us than any other reasonable Acts whatsoever; and that what we cannot do without being Lunatics or Ideots in other matters, we may there creditably do, and speak, and act, as absurdly as we will, with allowance.

But this kind of Doctrine is only to serve a turn, being fitted to those that are fitted for it, and to whom nothing can be absurd, which some Men say: For there are those amongst them cannot digest it; and do determine otherwise. So *Salmeron* the Jesuit, *If any one prays privately, and the things prayed for are not understood by him, he wastes his time: So he that speaketh publicly in an Unknown Tongue, which others do not understand, he doth yield no Fruit; and then certainly others receive none.* This the Council of *Trent* doth acknowledge, when it declares (as abovesaid) *It seems not expedient to the Fathers, That the Mass be celebrated in the Vulgar Tongue: And presently adds, Lest the*
Sheep

In 1 Cor. 14.

Sheep of Christ should hunger, and when the little ones ask bread, there is none to break to them; The Holy Synod commands all that have the care of Souls, frequently, &c. to expound somewhat of it. So that they grant without such Explication, the Faithful may hunger and be without profit; for what need would there be of Exposition, if the people may be as devout without it as with it? I shall conclude this with that of *S. Austin*, "We ought to understand, that we may sing with humane reason, not as it were with the Voice of Birds. For both Parrots, and Crows, and Pies, and the like, are often taught by Men to pronounce what they do not know — But to sing with understanding is granted by the Divine Will to mankind. So that according to him, if we set aside the Understanding, the Parrot of the Cardinal *Africanus*, had it been taught the Lord's Prayer, or other Forms of Devotion, as well as the Creed, might have contended in competition with those that hear, and sing, and pray, with Words, without understanding. Since whatever Affection and Devotion is pretended to without Knowledge, is like a *Vision of a Man's own Heart*, and not of Divine Illumination, that doth either proceed from Imagination or Imposture.

But that we may not think this Assertion of theirs [that *there may be profit without understanding, and Devotion without knowledge*] to be unreasonable, they both produce Experience, and endeavour also to give a rational account of it. The former is appealed to by the Rhemists; "As for Edification, that is, for increase of Faith, true Knowledge, and a good Life, the experience of
"a

*Exposit. in
Psalm. 18.*

*Rhodiginus,
L. 3. c. 32.*

Jerem. 23. 16.

*Ps. 461.
Hosius, p. 9.*

“a few Years hath given all the World a full demonstration, whether our Fore-Fathers were not, &c. as devout, as we are in all our Tongues, translations, and *English* Prayers.

And we are told, “That the people know what is done in the general, to wit, That God is worshipped and honoured; That the Priest prays to him; That good things are asked of him for the people; and thanks given to him, that the memory of Christ and his Passion are celebrated, and the Sacrifice offered to God. This no Clown is ignorant of; and this is enough.

*Leidesma, c. 21.
n. 23.*

This is somewhat like the course taken by *Socrates*, that said, He only pray'd in general, because what particular things were good for him, the Gods knew better than himself. But whether this be done among them, with as much reason; and whether with any respect to our Religion, and the several Offices of it, is now to be consider'd.

For our satisfaction herein we may observe,

I. They grant, That the people can and do understand no more by their Service than the general intent, and Points of it.

II. That the people cannot apply these Generals to the particular Points of it. So the Rhemists; *P. 463.*
“The simple people are not bound to know to what Petition their part pertaineth, &c. It is enough that the people can tell this holy Oraison “[the *Pater noster*] to be appointed to call upon God, &c.

III. That no more is necessary; and though they are to ask special things of God, yet it is not needful to understand what, or how, or when, or if at all they are specially prayed for. For then they

they would understand the specials.

But now this state of the Case will not solve the Point. For,

1 Cor. 14. 7,
8, 9, 16.

I. This is contrary to the Apostle, who doth maintain, That as the publick Service of God is to be ordered so, as to be for the edification of the Church; so the Church cannot be edified, without the Offices are administred in a Tongue that shall as distinctly and particularly signifie and point to the thing thereby to be expressed, as a Trumpet or the like Instrument doth give notice by a distinction of Sounds, when to advance or retreat, when to fight and when to forbear. And that every person, the unlearned as well as the learned, may know how to apply his *Amen* thereunto; but which he can no more do without understanding the Tongue, than He can know what motion or posture he is to observe that hath the Trumpet sounding to him without any distinction, and whose Sounds and Notes being confounded, give no direction to those that are to be guided by it. So *Aquinas*, "How shall he say *Amen*, when he "knows not what is pray'd for; because he cannot "understand, *Quid boni dicas, nisi quod benedicas*; "What good thou sayest, except that thou dost "blest?

In 1 Cor. 14.

II. The nature of the thing is against it. For as the Offices are various, and distinguished by their Ends and Uses; and we cannot attain those Ends, nor make use of those Offices, without the understanding of those Ends and Uses: So there are particular things respected in those Offices, which unless we also respect, we lose the benefit of them; but that we cannot do without a particular

cular knowledge of them. As for example, the
Romish Catechism saith, "That Prayer is the In-
 "terpreter of the Soul, and is directed to God or
 "the Saints." "That therein Men do confess their
 "sins, and pray for the pardon of them; that they
 "beg for others and themselves things Temporal,
 "Spiritual and Eternal; that therein also they
 "give Thanks for whatever good they have re-
 "ceived, and do enjoy. Now as these things are
 of different kinds, so according to their kind they
 require different dispositions, and so what are suitable
 to the one will not be suitable to the other. But
 if the knowledge be only general, that cannot pro-
 duce special dispositions; and he that ventures to
 be particular therein, may rejoyce and give Thanks
 when he is to mourn and confess; may mind
 Earthly things when the Prayer is for Heavenly;
 may imprecate when he should bless; and instead
 of *Ora pro nobis*, may say *Miserere nobis*, that is,
 make a Saint to be God, and apply that to the
 Officer of the Court of Heaven, which he
 should address only to the Judge. He may be all
 the while in a posture of contradiction to the
 Church, and have his dispositions so little suited
 to the solemnities of it, that the Priests may say
 to such, with some little variation, in the Words
 of the Gospel, *We have piped unto you, and ye have*
mourned; we have mourned unto you, and ye have
danced. So that unless they will say, There are
 no need of particular dispositions, according to
 the kinds, and special uses of the Offices of Re-
 ligion, they must say, That Service in an Unknown
 Tongue, is not for the edification of the Church.
 So *Aquinas* again, "He who doth hear and not

Part. 4. c. 1.
 Sect. 3. c. 2. Sect.
 2, 4, 10. c. 4.
 Sect. 3. 7. c. 6.
 Sect. 2. de orat.
 Dñin.

Catech. c. 6.
 Sect. 3.

Ibid.

E

"understand,

"understand, is not edified as far as he understands not, although he understand it in general.

III. If this were true, That a confused general knowledge is sufficient, yet this will not help them, or justify them in the use of an Unknown Tongue: For even the general knowledge they pretend to, doth not proceed from the Tongue (for that they understand not) but is obtained some other way, that is by some actions and Postures, some particular Words and Phrases, some Ceremonies and Signals given in the administration of their Service: And which would signifie as much for the most part without the Tongue and Words, as with the Tongue that is not understood.

IV. I shall add, That whereas they pretend experience in the case, and which for the present we shall not so far question, as utterly to deny, but that there may be, and is some Devotion amongst the ignorant sort of them; yet so far as this Devotion of theirs is real, it must be because of somewhat understood, but so far as it is without Instruction, so far unquestionably it proceeds only from the imagination; and if it rises from no better or higher a cause, whatsoever semblance it may have of Devotion, yet it hath no right to that Character. I shall make this clear by an instance or two. Not many years since, in a certain City of *Brabant*, there was for ornament a large Statue erected at a Conduit near the Market-place, to which the Country people as they passed to and fro, did often pay their Devotions (not discerning any difference betwixt that and an image of

of a Saint) so much to the publick scandal, that (to prevent any such mistake for the future) it was by command transformed into a little Boy, with a change also of the posture. Now if we would enquire into this Devotion, it is much what the same we are discoursing of. There wanted not an inward disposition, that inclined the people to it; there wanted not outward expressions, for they bowed before it, kissed the Feet of it, said their *Pater nosters*, &c. before it, and all with as much Devotion, as if it had been the Image of *S. Roch*, or *S. Sebastian*, or *S. Michael* himself (the Protector and Patron of the place). And yet all this being applyed to a common, and not a religious Object, and being only the Fruit of Imagination and not of Instruction, it deserved another name than Devotion, and was not so accounted by themselves. And now, why what is given, suppose to a right Object, but without knowledge, should not be equivalent to the other, that was intended to a right, but was addrested, by mistake, to a wrong, is not easie to discern? Furthermore, Let us suppose a Case, A person being beforehand possessed with a report of certain persons met together upon a design of Conjurat[i]on, comes to the place, and finds the Company there assembled; and hearing all that they say, performed in a Language he understands not, he presently is seized with a pannaick fear, and is every moment in expectation of the foell Fiend's appearance at their Summons; but is all this while abused, and under a mistake, for the persons were there met for Religious Worship, and so the ground of his fear imaginary. On the other hand, a person comes into a place, where he finds seve-

ral met. together, who using much the like postures as if they were at their Devotions, and also Words he understands not, but what for ought he knows, are the same that are used in the Church Service, he falls upon his Knees, pulls out his Beads, says an *Ave Maria*, or *Pater noster*, or what he has been used to in that kind. And now can there be any reason after all to conclude, That this Mans Devotion arose from any other cause than the others Fear, and that both did not proceed from the imagination? And can there be any reason to think, that what proceeds from such a cause, is fit to be Sainted, and be entitled to the name of true Piety and Devotion? So that to talk of Devotion without Instruction, or Instruction sufficient to create it, is to talk against the sense of Mankind, in which there may be, for ought I see, as much of mystery, but no more sense than in the wonted saying of *Anthony of Padua*, produced by *Belarmin* on this occasion, *That is a perfect Prayer, in which the mind is so swallowed up into God, that it doth not understand its own Words.* In this they agree, that in both Cases the Words and the Understanding are separated, but in this they differ, That His Understanding was (as it seems) beyond the Words; but in our Case the Words are beyond the Understanding. In both there is no need of Words, and where they are used, they cannot be the means of Devotion; which is no more to be found without the understanding, than the Understanding can be, can attend, or be moved by Words that it hath no knowledge of.

So that let them either take away the Words altogether, and use no Tongue in their Service, and

*De verbo. l. 2. c.
16. Sect. Obj.
2. praterea.*

and turn all into mummery and pageantry: Or else let them use such Words as will stir up religious Affections in the faithful, and answer the End for which they are used in publick (as they confess). For though we should be of the same mind with Bellarmine, That Instruction is not in the Sense, but in the Words; yet how a Man can understand the sence contained in the Words, without understanding the Words containing the sence, is as hard to understand, as how we can be Religious and Devout, without understanding, and for we know not what.

Catechis. Trid.
P. 4. c. 8. Sect. 3.

De verbo, l. 2.
c. 16. Sect.
Object. 4.

But to proceed to another Question.

III. Let us consider, Whether the worship so performed, as to leave those Ends unattainable, will be accepted by God? Divine Worship respects God as its Object, and so the End of it is the giving Honour to him by suitable Thoughts, Words and Actions (as has been before observed) but how that honour is to be given, as the nature of the thing, and Divine Institution are the Rule; so when that Honour is given to him, the Ends, for which the Worship it self is appointed and the Offices of it do serve, must determine. And if these Ends are not respected, nor can be attained in the way of its ministration, we may be confident, That as the Worship is not then worthy of God, so it is not accepted by him. Now,

As it has been already shewed what those Ends are, so it has been proved, that those Ends are not to be attained, where the Service is not in a Tongue known to the people, and so consequently will not be accepted by God. And for this we have the judgment of the Romish Church, when they discourse

Part 4. c. 8.
Sect. 1.

Ibid. c. 2. Sect. 3

discourse practically upon this Argument, and without respect to the controversie before us. Of this I shall give an instance in Prayer, (a point most of all insisted upon) of which it is said in general in the *Romish* Catechism, "That it is of special concernment after what manner we pray; for although Prayer be a saving good, yet unless it be rightly performed, it doth not profit. And elsewhere they insist upon several things that render our Prayers ineffectual, as the ignorance of what we pray for; and the want of attention or assent to what we pray, &c. And certainly if the Prayer without these Ends be not acceptable to God, then such a ministration of it, as renders those Ends unattainable, cannot be lawful to us, or be thought approved by him.

But how well and truly soever they speak in a case remote from Controversie, yet when they come to controvert the Point in hand, they do in effect unsay all that they have said; and then the Prayers used in the Church, though not at all understood by the people, are magnified for their use and benefit to Man, and for their acceptance with God.

Annot in 1 Cor.
14. p. 462.
Et Annot. in
Mat. 21. 16.

De ling. vernac.
p. 9.

Thus the Rhemists, "We doubt not but it is acceptable to God, and available to all necessities, and more agreeable to the use of all Christian people to pray in *Latin* than in the Vulgar, though every one in particular, understandeth not what he saith. And (saith Cardinal *Hosius*,) "When done to give honour to God, it is acceptable to him, and no understanding of Words can be compared to it.

To

25 To say that our Prayers are hindered of their
versue through ignorance or want of attention, &c.
 And that they be acceptable to God, though we un-
 derstand not what we say, are things irreconcilable.
 But setting aside the contradiction in it, they are
 not without some pretences to prove that the effi-
 cacy of the Divine Offices doth not depend upon
 the peoples understanding them. Now I might
 ease my self of these kind of Pleas, because they
 suppose that which has been already disproved, *viz.*
 That the affections can be benefited without the
 understanding. But yet because they are frequent-
 ly produced to prove as well the no necessity of
 Service in a Vulgar Tongue, and the lawfulness of
 having it in an Unknown Tongue, as that a Ser-
 vice of that kind is acceptable to God, and effica-
 cious to the people, I shall before I conclude this
 Head (to which they more peculiarly belong)
 take them into consideration.

Now their Arguments are taken partly from
 Scripture, and partly from some cases supposed to
 be parallel to this.

Object. 1. They say, "That the Children in the
 " Temple, as well as the people cryed, *Hosanna to the*
" Son of David, Matth. 21. 16. whereas they under-
 stood not what they said: And yet this was our
 Saviour pleased with, and defended them in.

Luke 19. 41, 42.
Matth. 21. 16.

But this is said with very little Reason: For

Ans. 1. It is more probable that they did under-
 stand, than that they did not: *Hosannah* being a form
 of solemn acclamation; and as easie to be under-
 stood by them in the signification; so also in the
 application of it to Christ upon this occasion; which,
 saith S. John 12. 17, 18. was, *Because the people*
had

had heard that he raised Lazarus. And whereas our Saviour applyes that of *Babes and Sucklings* to the case, that was not because these that cryed *Hosannah* were such, but that because God never wanted Instruments of his Glory, but could make use of such as were mean and unfit in themselves for it.

2. Supposing they did not understand, where is the consequence, that because *young Childrens Prayers proceeding from the instinct of God's Spirit be acceptable to God*, therefore the voices of other simple folk, now in the Church, though they themselves understand not what they say, be marvellous grateful to God, as the Rhemists say. As if an extraordinary case should be a Rule for us in an ordinary; and that Prayers proceeding from Children, by the instinct of God's Spirit, and who were little less miraculously empowered to do it, than the *Ass of Balaam* (if they were *Sucklings*, and such as could scarcely speak, as *Ledeſma* would have it) should teach us to choose what we do not understand. Or as if what was grateful to God from Children, who were in no capacity of doing better than following of others, though they did not understand, should excuse, nay recommend the Service of those that are in a capacity of understanding, and yet understand no more of what they offer to Almighty God in particular, than if they were *Babes and Sucklings*, and such as had no understanding.

The Apostle in 1 Cor. 14. 20. doth upon this occasion exhort, *Be not Children in understanding*, so as to think God pleased with that which doth not benefit us; or so as to think, That he who is

fo

Annot. in
Matth. 21. 16.

so merciful as to accept according to what a Man hath, should also be so remiss as to accept him that bringeth not what he hath. That when God hath given us a Tongue and Understanding, we should be debarred of the use of both in his Worship and Service, and yet our Service and our selves be as well accepted, as if both were employed therein. Certainly what will avail, where there is no capacity, will not avail when there is a capacity; and therefore it is a mean way of arguing, and will receive the same answer, *That they that have no use of Reason, are truly and efficaciously baptized, and so there is no need of understanding*; and it would have confuted it self, if they had added, (as they should) therefore those that have understanding, may as lawfully act, and shall be as certainly accepted, though they use not that understanding, as if they did.

*Bellarmin. l. 2. de
efficacia Sacram.
c. 32.
Rhem. annot.
p. 461.*

Object. 2. "Among the Jews the Prayers of the Priest, when he entred into the Holy of Holies, were accepted, though the people were without, *Lev. 16. 17.* and *Luk. 1. 9, 10.* Therefore the Service of the Church may be so said, as all the people understand it not, and also be accepted.

*Ledesma, c. 13.
n. 7.
Touchstone
of the Reformed
Gospel,
c. 52.*

Answer. 1. It is acknowledged on both sides that the High Priest's entring into the Holy of Holies, was typical of Christ, and the Atonement made by him, and consequently what the people could not bear a part in. But since the people are concerned with the Priest in the Offices of our Religion, and are to set their *Amen* to it, there is no parity betwixt the case then and the case now.

2. How is this a proof that they had their Service in an Unknown Tongue? Or if they were to

F

have

have it in a Known Tongue, how can they infer, That the High Priest might have used an Unknown Tongue, when praying with the people, and that this should have been as acceptable to God, and as beneficial to them, as if it had been understood?

*Ledesma, ibid.
Bellarm. de
verb. l. 2. c. 16.
Sess. Obj. 2.*

Obj. 3. But they say, it proves thus much, That Prayers though made for them, that do not hear or are absent, are effectual; and then why not as well for them that do not understand them though present?

This is an Argument they much insist upon. But,

1. If this were of any force, then we need no more to pray for our selves, because others pray for us, than we are not bound to understand what we pray, because those that pray for us do understand.

2. The Dispute is not, Whether persons in some cases may not be benefited by the Prayers of others, though they do not understand them, as when the Church prays for the absent as well as the present, and Christ in Heaven intercedes with success for his Church here, and those that are present pray for Children, Lunatics, and delirous: But whether such Prayers are acceptable to God, which a person himself is obliged to joyn in, and yet so little understands, as he knows not what he prays for, whether for himself or others; nor can be certain whether indeed he prays at all. *Monica* prayed for her Son *Austin* with that Fervour and Devotion, with such passion and continuance, that *S. Ambrose* told her, It was impossible a Son of such Prayers and Tears should miscarry: But if she had prayed in a Language she understood not, she

she would not have known what she prayed for, and she would then have found no Tears for her Prayers; or if she had had Prayers and Tears, they had both been lost with her Son. And although the Priest be a publick person, and offers up our Prayers to God, yet this doth not at all exclude the faithful from a share in them: And therefore as the Priest is the Mouth of the Congregation, and as such, he must use a Tongue the Congregation understands: So the Congregation is to attend to him, and to give their *Amen*, and Assent to what he in their name offers to God: And he is neither Priest nor Mouth to them, if he prevents them in their part, and renders them incapable of bearing a part in it, by using a Tongue they understand not. And therefore it's as necessary the Congregation should understand as the Priest, and if he do otherwise, he can no more justify himself, than if he did celebrate the Service in a Tongue he himself knew nothing of, and which neither the one nor the other did understand. So that upon the whole, we have reason to conclude with *Sanders*, That an Unknown Tongue is not profitable for the people; though he will not allow it for that Reason to be unlawful.

*Ledesma, c. 13.
n. 13.
Bellarm. ibid.*

*Orat. de ling.
Offic. Eccles.*

And that is the thing I shall now particularly enquire into, by considering,

IV. Whether from the Apostle's Discourse upon this Argument, it can be reasonably concluded, That Divine Service so administered, as not to be understood of the people, is unlawful?

In the Apostle's Discourse upon this Argument, 1 Cor. 14. there are two things agreed in betwixt the contending parties.

F 2

I. That

I. That the Service of God is so to be ordered, as may be for the edification of the Church, v. 4, 5, 12. And that what is inconsistent with the general, much more the universal Edification of it, is not to be allowed.

II. That an Unknown Tongue in such Assemblies and Offices as the Apostle speaks of, is inconsistent with, and cannot be for the publick Edification, v. 2, 6, 9, 11, 14, 16.

But though it be thus far agreed, yet they afterwards divide upon it from the Protestants.

For,

1. Some of the Church of *Rome* do say, That it is evident from this place of Scripture, that a Vulgar and Known Tongue was not used in those days in Publick Worship.

2. That if so be such was then used, yet the Apostle doth not forbid the use of an Unknown Tongue in it.

The first do wholly found what they have to say, upon Verse 16. *How shall he that occupieth the room of the Unlearned [or Idiot] say Amen, at thy giving of Thanks ?*

“ This shews [say they] that such giving of
“ Thanks was not accustomed to be made in the
“ Vulgar Tongue ; for had the Service been in
“ the Vulgar, there needed no Man to have supplied the place of the Idiot.

This at first sight may seem a pretty Argument to one that understands no more than *Latin* and *English* ; but the mischief of it is, that it's not true. Of this mind is *Bellarmin*, &c. who saith,

“ I. That the Greek Phrase *ὁ ἀναπληρῶν τὸν ἴδιον*,
“ according to the use of that Tongue, doth not
“ signifie

Idesma, c. 27.
n. 5, &c.
Sanders, orat.
de lingua, &c.

De verbo, l. 2.
c. 16. Sect. alii
ergo. *Rhem. an-*
not. p. 458.
Matg.

"signific one that is in the Head of an Idiot or un-
 "learned, But thereby are meant all rude unlearn-
 "ed Men. So *Chrysostom* and *Theophylact* expound
 "it, &c.

"2. There was no such custom in Apostolical
 "times, and long after, of one to answer in the
 "place of the Vulgar; but that the people were
 "wont to answer, as is evident from *Justin*
 "*Martyr*, &c.

After this Argument has been so clearly relin-
 quished, it might have been omitted by us, had it
 not been re-assumed with no little assurance and
 triumph by others since *Bellarmin's* time.

II. Those among them that do quit this, yet
 hold that the Apostle doth not forbid a Tongue
 so unknown, as the *Latin* is now, in Divine wor-
 ship. And for this they offer several Arguments,
 which will be all comprehended, and I conceive
 cleared, by considering,

1. What is meant by the Unknown Tongue, which
 the Apostle condemns?
2. What by the Assemblies, in which such an Un-
 known Tongue is forbid?
3. What by the Service used in those Assemblies?
4. How far the Apostle's Prohibition is to be ex-
 tended?

Quest. 1. As to the first.

They say, That the Tongues condemned were
 miraculous and extraordinarily infused, but what
 they plead for is acquired and learnt.

A. But supposing the Tongues were miraculous;
 yet what is this to the case in Hand, when they
 were not condemned for being miraculous (for as
 such they were Gifts from God and Signs to Men)

but

V. Petre sancte
c. 17. n. 5.
Touchstone
of the reform-
ed Gospel,
c. 52. p. 138.

Ledesma, c. 26.
Rhem. annot.
p. 461.

but as they were abused, and used neither to the Glory of God, nor the Edification of the Church. And by parity of reason, every Unknown Tongue, as well what is acquired as infused, is condemned also. The Miraculous Tongue was forbidden, when it did not profit, when it was a speaking to the air, when he that spoke was a Barbarian to him that heard, and when he that heard could not say *Amen* to him that spoke, Verse 2, 9, 11, 16. And if a Tongue acquired be as much unknown as a Tongue infused, the Reasons being common to both, the one is as much prohibited in those circumstances as the other.

Nay, according to their way of arguing, it will follow, That if Tongues miraculously infused, which were ~~used to them that believed not~~, might not be used in the Cases abovesaid, then much less may such as are acquired, by Education and other humane wayes.

But they say farther, "That the Apostle speaks of a Tongue which no one understands in the whole Church, but not of that which is understood by some, at least by him that officiates."

But for this they offer no manner of proof, neither is there any. For (1.) the Apostle speaks of such a Tongue as is not for the Edification of the Church; but if some only understand it; those that do not understand, are no more edified by the understanding of the rest, than if none understood it. (2.) There are two sorts of persons concerned, one that can say *Amen*, and another that cannot, whom the Apostle calls *Unlearned*. But the Unlearned are as well (as he saith) to be respected as the Learned; and the Unlearned being ordinarily

Billarm. *ibid.*
Sess. vii. igitur.
Sess. at ob-
jects. Sess. in
posteriori.
S. C. p. 176.

ordinarily more than the Learned ; it must consequently be such a Tongue which all of the most did understand that he pleads for ; and such a Tongue, which none or the fewest did understand, that he pleads against.

Lastly, They say, "The Apostle condemns a Barbarous Tongue, but not that which is understood by Learned and Civil people in every great City, as Hebrew, Greek and Latin." So the Rhetorists.

Annot. p. 461.

And we are further told, "That all Tongues are Barbarous, except those three."

Harding in
Jewel. divis.
3. p. 116.
Joh. Baptista
de Rubis Ra-
tionale, l. 2.
c. 9. Sanders
orat. &c.

But all this is spoken very precariously. For the Apostle excepts no Tongue, as a Tongue, from being barbarous. For that is barbarous with him that is not understood, whether it be Hebrew or Arabic, Greek or Syriac, Latin or Dalmatic. In this Sense Ovid took it, speaking of himself in Exile, amongst the Getae,

Barbarus hic ego sum, quia non intelligor ulli.

I am here a Barbarian, because I am not understood by any.

And in this sense it is here taken by ancient Expositors. Thus S. Jerom, Every Speech which is not understood is barbarous. Thus S. Chrysostom, and indeed several also amongst themselves.

In loc.

So that upon the whole it is manifest, that the Apostle means by an Unknown Tongue, that which is not understood of the People.

Salmiron. Iyra
in loc.

Quæst.

Bellarmin. l. 16.
lib. 1.
Rhemists an-
notat. p. 462.

Quest. What are the Assemblies in which the Apostle condemns the use of an Unknown Tongue?

The Champions of this Cause in the Church of Rome, do alledge, "That much of the Chapter refers to Spiritual Conferences and colloquatory Exercises then used in lesser Assemblies, which they endeavour to prove more especially from the Directions given by the Apostle, Verse 27, &c.

If we should grant that part of the Apostle's Discourse refers to such Conferences, yet what is this to that part of it that treats of Publick Worship? Or indeed what is it to the purpose at all, when there were mostly the same Offices used in one as the other, and the same End prescribed to the use of them in both? Those that do thus distinguish, have not ventured to tell us where the Apostle doth treat of the one, and where of the other: And it is evident that he applies his Argument of Edification to the whole, and then proceeds from one Office to another, from Propheying to Praying, and Singing, if not also to the Lords Supper. Now where the End is common to all, without distinction, the means conducing to that End are in all alike to be observed. And if in those lesser Assemblies (when they expounded, prayed or sung) they were to use a Tongue known to the Assembly, because without so doing, the Ends of their so assembling would have been defeated, then certainly it was, if not more, yet at least as necessary, that the same order be observed when the whole Church came together into one place.

Quest. What was the Service used in those Assemblies, and that was forbidden to be celebrated in an Unknown Tongue?

Some

Some of the Church of Rome will understand it only of preaching; and those that do grant it to respect Prayers, yet will have it understood of such Prayers as were inspired. But what though the Prayers were inspired, when they were to be uttered in a Tongue known to the Church, and were not to be used if they were not for the Edification of the Church; as they were not if not understood? And is not the Reason as full against Prayers not inspired, when they are not understood? The Question is not about Prayers, inspired or not inspired; but known and unknown; according to which all the Offices of the Church are to be tried, as to their lawfulness and experience.

But let the Prayers be as they will, yet say they, "The Apostle treats of them occasionally" only.

Supposing this so to be, yet that is not to the purpose, for the Question is not whether the Apostle, treats so expressly of Prayer as of prophesying; as whether the prohibition of an Unknown Tongue, and the Argument taken from the End of Divine Offices lie not as expressly against praying as prophesying in that way? And whether the Words, *If I pray in an Unknown Tongue, my Spirit prayeth, but my understanding remaineth unfruitful, &c.* v. 14, 16. are not as plain as *he that speaketh [or prophesyeth] in an Unknown Tongue, speaketh not unto Men, &c.* If the Prohibition be the same, and the reason of the prohibition be the same in both; then it is not the being expressly or occasionally handled, that can make so vast a difference, as that the former shall be lawful, and the latter unlawful.

G

Quest.

*Billarm. ibid.
Sed. Vera igitur.
Sed. ad hanc igitur.
Rhemists annot.
in 1 Cor. 14.
26. p. 460.*

*Sanders erat.
p. 64, 66.*

Quest. 4. How far is the Apostle's prohibition to be extended?

This will be determined partly from what hath been before said, and partly from the current of the Apostle's Discourse, who as he lays down that general Rule, *Let all things be done to Edifying*; so upon that principle, he prohibits the use of an Unknown Tongue, as inconsistent with it, Verse 14. *If I pray in an Unknown Tongue, my Spirit prayeth, but my understanding remaineth unfruitful.* Where he doth not speak of a better and worse, and prefer that which is understood before that which is not (as they would have it) but he speaks of a good and bad; and so doth absolutely condemn an Unknown Tongue for the unprofitableness of it. For, saith he, *My Spirit prayeth*, not the Affection, but the Spirit in the gift of an Unknown Tongue (as many of the Antients, and some of themselves expound it) *But my understanding remaineth unfruitful*, to my self, that is, if I do not understand it; and to others, if they do not understand me, as the Apostle doth explain it, Verse 16.

So that from the whole we may with good Reason conclude, That the administration of Divine Service in an Unknown Tongue is as unlawful as express Scripture can make it: And that after all their attempts to decline, pervert and overthrow it, the fourteenth Chapter of the first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, remains in full force against the Opinion and Practice of the Church of *Rome*; and is a sufficient Reason on their part, to keep the Scriptures in an Unknown Tongue, as long as their Service is, contrary to the Scripture, celebrated constantly in it.

S E C T.

Bellarmin.
Sect. in post.
viore.
Rhemists an-
not. p. 460.

S. Chrysost.
Homil. 35.
Theophylact.
Salmeron in
loc.
Hieron. in loc.

S E C T. III.

I shall enquire, Whether the celebrating Divine Service in a Tongue not understood of the people, hath been the antient Rite of every Church?

I. I shall consider whether it hath been an *antient Rite*?

II. Whether from the time of its having been a *Rite*, it hath been the *Rite* and Custom of every Church?

Both of these are affirmed by the Council of Trent.

Qu. I. Whether it hath been an *antient Rite*?

Antient is a Term of an uncertain date, and seems to have been chosen by the Council upon mature deliberation; lest peradventure if it had been determined, it might have been so late, as to be of no authority in it self; or so early, as, for want of truth, it might have given a foul shock to its own Authority. But however, because nothing can be antienter than what is first, let us consider how Service was administred in Apostolical times; and so downwards, as much before the Council as any thing can be reasonably said to be *antient* by it. I have already accounted for the Apostle's sence in this matter, which *Cassander* calls (after *S. Chrysostome in loc.*) an Apostolical Command for Service in a Tongue understood of the people. And if we take a step lower, and so proceed, we shall find an uncontrollable Evidence for it, both as to the Judgment and Practice of the Church. In the first place (setting aside the pretended Litur-

*De Offic. pii
viri, p. 863.*

*Salomon in
1 Cor. 14. Sisti.
His igitur.
Apolog. sub fin.*

gies of *S. James* and *S. Clement*, which are however plainly for it, as is acknowledged) is *Justin Martyr*, that flourished about 150 years after Christ, who relates, "That after the Bishop had concluded his Prayer and giving of Thanks, all the people did assent to it with an *Amen*. Which they could not have done, as the Apostle and Fathers affirm, unless they understood what was prayed for. To this purpose doth *Clemens Alexandrinus* also write, who lived toward the close of the second Century.

*Contra Cris. l.
8. p. 402. Canon.
1abr.*

Origen, who lived about the middle of the third Century, saith, "The Greek Christians in their Prayers used the Græcian, and the Romans used the Roman Words, and each prays and praises God in his own Tongue. And the Lord of all Tongues doth hear those that pray to him in all Tongues, &c. *S. Cyprian* at the same time, doth say, "That the Mind in Prayer doth think of nothing else but what is prayed for. And therefore the Priest before Prayer doth prepare the Minds of the Brethren, by saying, *Lift up your Hearts*, that when the people doth answer, *We lift them up unto the Lord*, they may be admonished, that they ought to think of nothing but the Lord. For not the sound of the Voice, but the Mind must pray to the Lord.

*In orat. Dom.
n. 22.*

*Apud Enseb.
Eccles. Hist.
l. 7. c. 8.*

Dionysius Alexandrinus, that lived in the same Age, in a Letter to *Xystus* Bishop of Rome, doth write of a person that having been baptized by Hereticks, upon the hearing the Questions and Answers at the Baptism of the Orthodox, questioned his own Baptism. But saith he, we would

not

not rebaptize him, because he had for a good while held Communion with us in the Eucharist, and had been present at our giving of Thanks, and answered, *Amen*.

S. *Basil*, who flourished about the year 370, putting the Question, *How the Spirit prays, and the Mind is without Fruit?* answers, "It is meant of those that pray in a Tongue unknown to them that hear. For when the Prayers are unknown to them that are present, the mind is without Fruit to him that prays, &c.

Tom. 2. Reg.
Brev. 108. 278.

And as to the Practice of the Church in the publick Service, he declares, "That the people had the Psalms, Prophets and evangelical Commands: And when the Tongue sings, the Mind doth search out the sence of the things that are spoken. And he relates how the Christians used to spend the Night in Prayers, Confessions and Psalms; one beginning, and the rest following. And that the noise of those that joyned in the Prayers, was like that of the Waves breaking against the Shoar.

Tom. 1. in Psal.
28.

Tom. 2. Epist.
63. Cler. Nec.
ocul.
Tom. 1.
Hexameri.
Hom. 4. sub
fin.

With him we have S. *Ambrose* agreeing (that lived much about the same time) who saith, "It is evident that the Mind is ignorant, where the Tongue is not understood; as some *Latines* that are wont to sing in Greek, being delighted with the sound of the Words, without understanding what they say. And again, "the unskilful hearing what he doth not understand, knows not the conclusion of the Prayer, and doth not answer *Amen*, that is, it is true, that the Blessing may be confirmed. For by those is the confirmation of the Prayer fulfilled, that do answer *Amen*, &c. And he doth shew what

1^a 1 Cor. 14. v.
Nam si oia. vno.

Ibid. Quis sup-
plet locum.

*ibid. Si a. om-
nes prophetant.*

what an honour is given to God, what a reverence is derived upon our Religion, and how far it excels the Pagan, that he that hears understands, and that nothing is in the dark.

*Tom. 3. Comm.
l. 7. in Luc. 15.
p. 169. Par.
1614.*

And he saith, " This is a symphony, when there is in the Church a concord of divers Ages and Vertues: that the Psalm is answered, and *Amen* said, &c.

*In 2 Cor. c. 8.
Homil. 18.
"Hinc."*

Toward the latter end of the same Century lived *S. Chrysostome*, who saith, " That the people are much concerned in the Prayers, that they are common to them and the Priest; that in the Sacrament, as the Priest prays for the people, so the people for the Priest. And that those Words *and with thy Spirit*, signifie nothing else ——— And what wonder is it, That in the Prayers the people do talk with the Priest?

*In 1 Cor. 14.
Hom. 35.*

And elsewhere he saith, " That the Apostle shews that the people receive no little damage, when they cannot say *Amen*.

*L. 2. c. 16.
Sess. idem eti-
am. v. Chry-
sost. Tom. 4.
Par. 1621.*

To conclude, *Bellarmin* saith, That in the Liturgy which bears this Fathers name, the parts sung by the Priest, Deacon and People, are most plainly distinguished.

*Tom. 1. Epitap.
Paulæ ad Eu-
stochium.
E. i. b. Paulæ
ad Marcellam.*

To him let us add *S. Jerom* his cotemporary, who declares that at the Funeral of *Paula* in *Jerusalem*, the multitude did attend, and sung their Psalms in *Hebrew, Greek, Latin* and *Syriack*, according to the Nations they were of. And we are further told, That at *Bethlem* there resorted *Gauls, Britains, Armenians, Indians, &c.* and there were almost as many Choirs of Singers as of Countries; of a different Tongue, but of one and the same Religion.

And

And the same Father tells us, That at *Rome* the people founded forth *Amen*, like to the noise of Thunder.

Tom. 10. *proem.*
2. ad Galat.

Next let us consult *S. Augustine*, of the same time, who saith, "That no body is edified by what he doth not understand. And, "That the reason why the Priest lifts up his Voice in the Church when he prayeth, is not that God, but the people may hear and understand, and joyn with him. And that whereas the Bishops and Ministers of the Church were sometimes guilty of using barbarous and absurd Words that they should correct it that the people may most plainly understand, and say *Amen*."

Tom. 3. in *Genes.*
l. 12. c. 8.
Lib. de Magi-
stro. c. 1, & 7.
De Catechis.
rud. c. 9.

And elsewhere (as has been quoted before) exhorts that they be not as Parrots and Pies that say they know not what.

In *Isa.* 28.

Thus far our Authorities do proceed with little interruption. For *Bellarmin* doth grant, "That not only in the times of the Apostles, all the people were wont to answer in Divine Offices; but that the same was a long time after observed both in the *Eastern* and *Western* Church, as is evident from *S. Chrysostome*, *S. Jerom*, &c.

c. 16. *Sist.* sed
requit.

Now having derived the Title thus far for above 400 years, we need not be much solicitous for what was introduced afterwards; but yet for a farther confirmation, I shall add some Testimonies of a later date. Such is that known Edict of the Emperour *Justinian* (who dyed Anno 565.) in which it is thus enacted, *We command all Bishops and Priests to celebrate the holy Oblation, and the Prayers in sacred Baptism, not in a low, but such a Voice, as may be heard by the people; that thereby*

their

Novel. 123.
See this vin-
dicated in Bi-
shop Jewels
reply to Har-
ding's answ.
p. 128.

their Hearts may be raised up with greater Devotion, and Honour be given to God; for so the Holy Apostle teacheth, in the first to the Corinthians, For if thou only blest with the Spirit, &c.

*De Eccles. off.
l. 1. c. 10.*

To this I shall add that of *Isidore Hispalensis*, that lived in the end of the fifth Century, who saith, "That it behoveth that when it is sung in the Church, that all do sing; and when Prayers are offered, that all do pray; and when there is reading, that all do read, and silence being made, that all hear.

*Aeneas Sylvius
Hist. Bohem. l.
1. c. 13. Anno
860.*

This is also agreeable to the former Opinion of the Church of *Rome* it self; and for proof of which, what can we desire more than the Declarations of Popes and Councils? and this we have. For we read of a permission given by the Pope to the *Moravians*, at the instance of *Cyrl* (who had converted them and other Nations of the *Sclavonians*) to have Divine Service in their own Tongue; and that he and the Conclave were induced to it (when not a few did oppose it) by a Voice from Heaven, that said, *Let every Spirit praise the Lord, and every Tongue confess to him, as Aeneas Sylvius, afterward Pope, relates.*

*Concil. Tom. 24.
Epist. 247.
Paris, 1644.*

And Pope *John* the VIII. (not long after, in *Anno* 880.) writes thus to *Sfento opulcer*, a Prince of the *Sclavonians*, "We command that the Praises and Works of our Lord Christ, be declared in the same [*Sclavonian*] Tongue. For we are admonished by sacred Writ, to praise the Lord, not only in three, but in all Tongues, saying, *Praise the Lord all ye Nations, praise him all the people.* And the Apostles filled with the Holy Ghost, spake in all Tongues. And *S. Paul* ad-

"monisheth

“monifheth, *Let every Tongue confefs*; and in the
 “firft to the *Corinthians*, he doth fufficiently and
 “plainly admonifh us, that in fpeaking we fhould
 “edifie the Church of God. Neither doth it hin-
 “der the Faith or Doctrine, to have the Maff
 “fung, or the Gofpel and Lessons well tranflated,
 “read, or other divine Offices fung in the fame *Scla-*
 “*vonian* Tongue; becaufe he who made the
 “three principal Tongues, *viz. Hebrew, Greek and*
 “*Latin*, made all to his praife, &c.

And conformable to this is the Decree of the Council
 of *Lateran* under *Innocent III. Anno 1215.* that can. 9.
 “becaufe in many parts, within the fame City and
 “Diocelf, there are many people of different man-
 “ners and Rites mixed together, but of one Faith,
 “We therefore command that the Bifhops of fuch
 “Cities or Diocelfes provide fit Men who fhall ce-
 “lebrate Divine Offices, according to the diverfity of
 “Tongues and Rites, and adminifter the Sacraments.

This may be further confirmed by the very Offi-
 ces of the Church of *Rome*; but this is fufficient to
 fhew that the Church of *Rome* hath departed from
 Scripture, Antiquity, and it felf, when it doth re-
 quire that Divine Service be performed in a Tongue
 unknown to the people: and that it was never the
 opinion of the Fathers, nor any Church, nor even
 of the Church of *Rome*, that it is moft expedient
 to have it fo performed. So little was it then thought
 that religious things the lefs they are underftood,
 the more they would be admired; and that to pre-
 ferve a reverence for them, and the people from
 dangerous errors, it is requifite to keep them from
 being underftood. So little was it pleaded, that
 there are any Tongues facred in themfelves; and

Vid. Caffandri
Liturg. c. 36.

Epif. Cleri
Gall. collect.
p. 63.
Epif. P.
Alex. 7. in
Collect. p. 69.
Hofius, p. 64.

H

that

Bellarmin. *Stiff.*
Septimo.
P. Sancti. c. 17.
n. 3.
E. IV. Truth
will oat, p. 45,
47.

Foterius, c. 22.
Portraiture, c.
14. p. 224.
Bellarmin. l. 1.
de missa, c. 11.
Sanders orat.
p. 72.

Rhem. Annot.
p. 461.

Cassander. Li-
urgic. c. 11,
13, 15.

Ledesma, c. 33.
n. 5.
Bellarmin. c. 16.
Stiff. obj. ult.
Salmeron. in
1 Cor. 16. Stiff.
Septimo.

that as the three upon the Cross of Christ, are to be preferred before others, and to exclude the rest ; so the *Latin* as next to the head of Christ, is the most venerable of the three. So little was it then thought that there is a certain kind of Divinity in *Latin*, and something more of Majesty, and fitter to stir up Devotion than in other Tongues. So little were they afraid, that *Latin* would be lost, if the Service were not kept in it ; or however, so little evident is it, that they valued the preservation of that Tongue above the Edification of the Church.

Lastly, So little did they think of the expedience of having the Service in one common Tongue, as *Latin*, *That Christians wherever they travel, may find the self same Service, and Priests may officiate in it as at home.* As if for the sake of the few that travel, the many that stay at home should be left destitute, and for one Mans convenience, 10000. be exposed to eternal perdition. These are Arguments coined on purpose to defend the Cause, and so are peculiar to the Church that needs them.

II. Let us consider, Whether from the time of its having been a *Rite*, it hath been *the Rite of every Church.*

To this I shall only produce their own Confessions, for it is acknowledged that the *Armenians, Egyptians, Habassines, Muscovites* and *Sclavonians*, have their Service in a Tongue known to the people. And their giving them the hard Names of Hereticks, Schismaticks and Barbarous, will not save the Council from being fallible, when it saith, *It is the rite of every Church.*

But were there no such Churches in the World, that herein practised contrary to the Church of
Rome,

Rome, yet it would no more justifie her, than it can make that good which is evil, that expedient which is mischievous to the Church of God, or reconcile one part of the Council to the other, that when it hath declared, *The Mass contains great instruction for the people*, yet adds, *That it is expedient and an approved Rite, that it be not celebrated in the Vulgar Tongue.*

But say they, this is granted, If there were no interpretation, but that is provided for by the Council, for it is ordered, *That lest Christs sheep should hunger, all that have the care of Souls shall frequently expound, &c.* And that we are now to consider.

S E C T. IV.

Whether the Provision made by the Council of Trent for having some part of the Mass expounded, be sufficient to countervail the mischief of having the whole celebrated in a Tongue not understood of the people, and to excuse the Church of Rome, in the injunction of it?

This is the last refuge they betake themselves to; confessing that without an Interpretation S. Paul is against them, but with this, they plead, he is for them.

S. C. Answ. to
D. Piece, p. 175;
Sanders orat.
p. 63.

But what shall we then think of the case in their Church at a time, when as the people could not understand, so the Priests could not interpret, and wanted both the gift, and had not acquired so much as the art of it? What shall we think of their case, and their Church, that hath neither provided nor doth use such an Interpretation as the Apostle speaks of; but what differs as much from it in respect of

Extract. ex re-
gist. Facult.
Par. an. 1525.
Collectio. p. 8.
Censura. An.
1655. p. 18.
Procez. contr.
Voisin. An.
1660. p. 55.
&c.
Epist. Cleri An.
1660. p. 62.

the light it gives to the people, as both that and the Tongue they use, do in the way by which they are obtained? If it were a translation, what a ludicrous thing would it be for a Church in its constant Service to take, suppose, the Lord's Prayer in pieces, and first pronounce it in *Latin*, and then in *English*? But as they do not permit their Offices, not the *Hora B. Virginis*, *Breviary*, or *Mass Book* to be translated into a Vulgar Tongue: So the verbal translation of it, *during the celebration of Mass*, was never thought of by the Council, but was thereby condemned, *as the cause and seedplot of many errors*; as we are informed in a Letter, wrote upon the occasion of *Voisin's* translation, by the whole Clergy of *France*, to Pope *Alexander* the Seventh.

And whatsoever the Exposition did refer to (let it be what it will) yet it was not to the devotional Part, as *Sanders* declares; who (after he had pleaded that an Unknown Tongue with interpretation, was the perfect fulfilling of *S. Pauls* advice) perceiving a difficulty behind, throws all off with this, *If the Interpretation of Prayers be laid aside for a season, it is however not to be thought, that it is to be omitted for ever, &c.* So that at most, no more was intended than a short exposition of some doctrinal Point or Ceremony (which might as well be called an Exposition of the *Breviary*, or any other Book, containing much the same things, as the *Missal*) And it is probable that so much as this also was never intended, which if ever, is very rarely practised amongst them. Inſomuch as *Ecdesias* saith, That the fence of the Council was, *That the people should be instructed only by Sermons*, Indeed they would

Cap. 15. Sect.
Decret. Con.
Tid. n. 2.

would rather have this go for an Argument, than dispute it. They do as the *Irish* by their Bogs, run over it lightly, for fear if they tread too hard, it will not support their cause but stifle it. And therefore they wheel off again, and then tell us, *That it being a known-set Form, in one set Language, those that are ignorant of it at first, need not continue so, but by due attention and diligence may arrive to a sufficient knowledge.* As if the poor people are inexcusable, if they do not arrive to a *sufficient knowledge* of the Tongue (which must be learned before the things) without other helps than their own attention and diligence; when the Priests and others are trained up to the knowledge and understanding of *Latin* by Rules, Masters, and frequent exercise. Surely they had the Mass in *Latin*, when the Learned themselves did not understand it, as *Valla* saith. They had the Mass in *Latin*, when the greatest part of the people did not understand it, as *Faber* relates. They had the Mass in *Latin*, when not only the people but the Priest and Deacons, rarely understood what they prayed, for as *Billet*, &c. confess. And where was then their attention and diligence, that to their lives end, either daily rehearsed it, or often heard it, and yet never understood it? And is it not so still, when notwithstanding all the noise of *Exposition, Manuals and Primers*, &c. for the use of the Vulgar, yet (setting aside some little Forms, and the Ceremonies of it) they are so ignorant of the Contents of the *Missal* or *Mass Book*, that as to the matter of it, they know it not from the Breviary; nor would know it from the *Alcoran*, if read in the same Tongue, alike pronounced, and the same falls and postures were used in the reading of it? So that
 what.

S. C. Answ.
 p. 176.

Elegant. Pref.

In 1 Cor 14.
 Cassand. Liturg. c. 36.
 Sixt. Senens.
 Biblioth. 6.
 Annot. 263.

S. C. p. 176.

what more plain than the means they have provided is not sufficient for to instruct and edifie the people ; and that after all, they do hold this instruction unnecessary, and that the people are safe without it? And this is the case, for it is generally resolved by their Casuists, both for Priest and People, that "they do their duty and merit, when they say their Prayers, though they do not understand ; so *Eckius*, so *Salmeron*, &c. And "if it were otherwise, very few would do their duty, when so very few do at all understand what they say, as Cardinal *Tolet* doth determine. So indulgent are they ; and very reasonable is it that they should be so, that when they have put out the peoples Eyes, they should take good care to make the way broad and smooth for them.

But in good earnest, can we think this way as safe as it is broad, and that there is no *Ditch* into which both Priest and People, if alike blind, may fall and perish? And if there be, must not the case of that people be very lamentable that are wholly left to the ability and sincerity of their Priest? who if he wants the former, may, through ignorance, turn the most solemn part of their Service, as it happens, into Nonsense or Blasphemy. And if he wants the latter may use a Spell for Prayer, and the antient charm of *Abracadabra* for *Ave Maria* (as a learned person hath observed). Nay instead of baptizing in the sacred Name of the *Father, &c.* he may do by the person, as a Jew under the profession of a Priest, is said to have done by a certain Prince in the last Age, and baptize him in the horrid name of the *Devil*. There is then nothing so absurd or wicked, which, according to the case, may not be practised. And neither Prayers be Prayers, nor Sacraments Sacraments,

*Salmeron. in 1
Cor. 16. Disp. 3.*

Instruct. Sacerd. c. 13. n. 5, & 6.

*D. Stillingfleet
Answ. to T.G.
c. 3. Sect. 3.*

ments, nor persons Christians, as long as the Priest doth alone know, or neither Priest nor People understand.

But supposing that there be no defect in either of these, and that the whole Service is faithfully and understandingly performed; yet if the Tongue in which it is performed be not understood of the people, there can be no understanding of the sense contained in it; and where the sense and matter is not understood, there cannot be (as I have shewed) those dispositions of Soul, that attention of Mind, that Faith which gives the *Amen* to our Prayers, &c. and which renders the Service acceptable to God and beneficial to our selves; and consequently a service so contrived, as shall defeat those ends, is one of the greatest mischiefs that can befall a Church, and must render the Romish Church inexcusable in the injunction of it, and justify those that have reformed it.

S E C T. V.

We are come to enquire, Whether upon the whole, the Service of God ought not to be celebrated in a Tongue vulgarly understood?

The Church of Rome doth anathematize, and doom to Hell, those that hold a Vulgar Tongue necessary in Divine Service; and doth both absolutely forbid their own *Missal* to be so translated, and persecute those that have so used it. And yet they cannot, dare not say it is unlawful in it self. For it is better to have it in the Vulgar than not at all; saith one. It is matter of Discipline, saith a second. It hath been granted in some cases, is acknowledged

by

*B llarm. c. 26.
sub fin.
T. G. Against
D. Stillingfleet,
Secd 8. n. 3.
p. 28.
Ledesma, c. 33.
n. 1.*

*Callander. de
off. pii viri, p.
865.*

by others. And it is most expedient to have it in the Vulgar, saith a fourth. And if so, why this diligent care to prevent and suppress it? Why this outcry against it? Why this Severity? What need of such Decrees and Anathemas of Councils? What need such Commands of the Popes for Princes to oppose it with all their force (as that of Gregory VII. to *Wratisslaus* of *Bohemia*) what reason is there for a general Convention of the Clergy of a Kingdom to proceed against a translation of their Missal? When if we consult the ends for which the publick Service was instituted, if we consult the reason of the thing; if we consult Scripture, or Fathers, or the practice of the Church for about seven hundred Years together, we shall find that it is not only expedient, but necessary to have it in a Tongue understood of the people; and that the Church of *Rome* that is so forward in its Anathema, is under a precedent, and greater one, even that of the Apostle, *Whosoever shall preach any other Gospel, let him be Anathema*. So that which is most to be respected, the Anathema of Heaven, or that of the Council; the command of God, or a Decree of a Pope; the Church of God in its best times, or the particular Church of *Rome* in latter Ages; whether the edification of the Church of God, or the will and interest of a corrupted Church, is not difficult to conceive. And therefore we may end as we began, with the Church of *England*. *It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the custome of the Primitive Church, to have publick Prayers in the Church, or to minister the Sacraments in a Tongue not understood of the people.*

Art. 24.

FINIS.

